



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/099,931 | 03/14/2002 | Oliver Bremer | 944-004.002/NC 16334 US | 2705 |
| 4955 | 7590 | 05/08/2008 | EXAMINER | |
| WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5 755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224 MONROE, CT 06468 | | | HENNING, MATTHEW T | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 2131 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 05/08/2008 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/099,931 | BREMER, OLIVER |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | MATTHEW T. HENNING | 2131 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 March 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3-8,10-15,17-22,24-28,33 and 34 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,3-8,10-15,17-22,24-28,33 and 34 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 17 June 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

1 This action is in response to the communication filed on 3/11/2008.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

4 Applicant's arguments filed 3/11/2008 have been fully considered but they are moot in
5 view of the new grounds of rejection presented below.

6 All objections and rejections not set forth below have been withdrawn.

7 Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, 17-22, 24-28, and 33-34 have been examined.

Specification

9 The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the
10 claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the
11 following is required: The claims, as amended, recite “forwarding peer-to-peer content between
12 two mobile phones communicating in a **cellular** network via a network infrastructure”. While
13 the specification provides support for a “wireless” network, the examiner is unable to find
14 support in the specification for a cellular network. The examiner is also unable to find support in
15 the specification for forwarding peer-to-peer content between two mobile phones communicating
16 in a cellular network. Furthermore, the applicant has failed to show where support for these
17 newly added limitations can be found in the specification. As such, the specification is objected
18 to for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See the rejection
19 of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112 1st Paragraph below.

20

21

22

Claim Objections

Claims 3-6 and 12 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 3, 5 and 12 all recite “the wireless sender” or “the wireless recipient”, which both antecedent basis in the claim. The examiner will assume, for purposes of searching prior art these limitations were meant to read “the mobile phone sender” and “the mobile phone recipient” respectively. Claims 4 and 6 are objected to as they depend from the above objected claims. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, 17-22, 24-28, and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably app to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, in possession of the claimed invention. The claims, as amended, recite “forwarding peer-to- content between two mobile phones communicating in a cellular network via a network structure” or similar limitations regarding a cellular network. While the specification provides support for a “wireless” network, the examiner is unable to find support in the application for a cellular network. The examiner is also unable to find support in the application for forwarding peer-to-peer content between two mobile phones communicating in a cellular network. Furthermore, the applicant has failed to show where support for these newly

1 added limitations can be found in the specification. As such, the ordinary person skilled in the
2 art would be unable to determine whether the applicant was in possession of the invention, as
3 claimed, at the time of application. Therefore, the claims are rejected for failing to meet the
4 written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112 1st Paragraph.

5

6 ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7 The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
8 obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

9 (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
10 section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
11 such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
12 having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the
13 manner in which the invention was made.

14
15 Claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, 10-11, 13-15, 17, 19-21, 27-28, and 34 rejected under 35
16 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Safadi et al. (US Patent Application Publication
17 Number 2002/0147686) hereinafter referred to as Safadi, and further in view of Bloebaum et al.
18 (US Patent Number 7,149,534) hereinafter referred to as Bloebaum, and further in view of Hans-
19 Jörg Vögel et al. (“GSM Switching, Services and Protocols: Second Edition”) hereinafter
20 referred to as Vögel.

21 Regarding claims 1 and 28, Safadi disclosed a method comprising: forwarding peer-to-
22 peer content between two devices (Safadi Fig. 1 Elements 10 and 30) communicating in a
23 wireless network via a network infrastructure (Safadi Fig. 1 Element 20 and paragraph [0032]),
24 where a wireless sender (10) encrypts protected content or content encryption key (Safadi
25 Paragraphs [0036] - [0037]) and a wireless recipient (30) consumes the protected content without
26 requiring content personalization assistance from the network infrastructure of the wireless

Art Unit: 2131

1 network (See Safadi Paragraph 0044), and that the receiver device was a mobile phone (Safadi
2 Paragraph [0033]), but Safadi failed to specifically teach that the sender device was a mobile
3 phone; that the sender sends an initial message having an international mobile equipment
4 identity, a mobile phone sender name, or mobile station international integrated subscriber digital
5 network number. However, Safadi did state that the "transmitting device of the present invention
6 includes, but is not limited to the Personal Versatile Recorder (10) as described hereinabove...or
7 any device that can output information in the form of a digital or analog signal".

8 Bloebaum teaches a system wherein, through a cellular network, mobile phones are able
9 to communicate content, such as applications or music, between the mobile phones (Bloebaum
10 Fig. 1 and Col. 4 Lines 59-61).

11 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
12 invention to have employed the teachings of Bloebaum in the content sharing system of Safadi
13 by implementing the transmitting device as a cell phone. This would have been obvious because
14 the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to allow multimedia content to
15 be shared between friends using their cell phones.

16 Vögel teaches that in GSM, which was a very well known and widely utilized mobile
17 communications standard at the time of invention, communicating devices register with the
18 network by sending the International Mobile Station Equipment Identity (IMEI) (Vögel Page 31
19 Section 3.2.1).

20 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
21 invention to have employed the teachings of Vögel in the content sharing system of Safadi and
22 Bloebaum, by having each cell phone provide its IMEI to the network in "an initial message".

1 This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been
2 motivated to follow an widely accepted standard as well as to recognize obsolete, stolen, or
3 nonfunctional equipment in the network.

4 Regarding claim 8, Safadi disclosed a wireless network comprising: at least two wireless
5 terminals (Safadi Fig. 1 Elements 10 and 30) and a network infrastructure (20) for forwarding
6 peer-to-peer content from one wireless terminal (10) to another wireless terminal (30) (Safadi
7 Fig. 1 Element 20 and Paragraph [0032]); the at least two wireless terminals having a peer-to-
8 peer forwarding/reception of digital right management protected content module configured for
9 **either** encrypting **or** consuming protected content without content personalization assistance
10 from the network infrastructure (See Safadi Paragraphs 0032, 0036-0037, and 0044), and that the
11 receiver terminal was a mobile phone (Safadi Paragraph [0033]), but Safadi failed to specifically
12 teach that the sender device was a mobile phone; that the peer-to-peer forwarding/reception of
13 digital rights management protected content module of each terminal is configured for either
14 sending or receiving an initial message having an international mobile equipment identity, a
15 mobile phone sender name, or mobile station international integrated subscriber digital network
16 number. However, Safadi did state that the “transmitting device of the present invention
17 includes, but is not limited to the Personal Versatile Recorder (10) as described hereinabove...or
18 any device that can output information in the form of a digital or analog signal”.

19 Bloebaum teaches a system wherein, through a cellular network, mobile phones are able
20 to communicate content, such as applications or music, between the mobile phones (Bloebaum
21 Fig. 1 and Col. 4 Lines 59-61).

Art Unit: 2131

1 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
2 invention to have employed the teachings of Bloebaum in the content sharing system of Safadi
3 by implementing the transmitting device as a cell phone. This would have been obvious because
4 the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to allow multimedia content to
5 be shared between friends using their cell phones.

6 Vögel teaches that in GSM, which was a very well known and widely utilized mobile
7 communications standard at the time of invention, communicating devices register with the
8 network by sending the International Mobile Station Equipment Identity (IMEI) (Vögel Page 31
9 Section 3.2.1).

10 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
11 invention to have employed the teachings of Vögel in the content sharing system of Safadi and
12 Bloebaum, by having each cell phone provide its IMEI to the network in "an initial message".
13 This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been
14 motivated to follow a widely accepted standard as well as to recognize obsolete, stolen, or
15 nonfunctional equipment in the network.

16

17 Regarding claim 15, Safadi disclosed a wireless terminal (10 or 30) comprising: one or
18 more modules for operating in a wireless network having another wireless terminal (10 or 30)
19 and a network infrastructure (20) for forwarding peer-to-peer content from the wireless terminal
20 (10) to the other wireless terminal (30) (Safadi Fig. 1 Element 20 and paragraph [0032]); a peer-
21 to-peer forwarding/reception of digital rights management protected content module configured
22 for either encrypting, consuming, or a combination thereof, protected content without content

Art Unit: 2131

1 personalization assistance from the network infrastructure (See Safadi Paragraphs 0032, 0036-
2 0037, 0042 and 0044) and that the receiver terminal was a mobile phone (Safadi Paragraph
3 [0033]), but Safadi failed to specifically teach that the sender device was a mobile phone; that
4 the peer-to-peer forwarding/reception of digital rights management protected content module of
5 each terminal is configured for either sending or receiving an initial message having an
6 international mobile equipment identity, a mobile phone sender name, or mobile station
7 international integrated subscriber digital network number. However, Safadi did state that the
8 "transmitting device of the present invention includes, but is not limited to the Personal Versatile
9 Recorder (10) as described hereinabove...or any device that can output information in the form
10 of a digital or analog signal".

11 Bloebaum teaches a system wherein, through a cellular network, mobile phones are able
12 to communicate content, such as applications or music, between the mobile phones (Bloebaum
13 Fig. 1 and Col. 4 Lines 59-61).

14 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
15 invention to have employed the teachings of Bloebaum in the content sharing system of Safadi
16 by implementing the transmitting device as a cell phone. This would have been obvious because
17 the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to allow multimedia content to
18 be shared between friends using their cell phones.

19 Vögel teaches that in GSM, which was a very well known and widely utilized mobile
20 communications standard at the time of invention, communicating devices register with the
21 network by sending the International Mobile Station Equipment Identity (IMEI) (Vögel Page 31
22 Section 3.2.1).

1 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
2 invention to have employed the teachings of Vögel in the content sharing system of Safadi and
3 Bloebaum, by having each cell phone provide its IMEI to the network in "an initial message".
4 This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been
5 motivated to follow an widely accepted standard as well as to recognize obsolete, stolen, or
6 nonfunctional equipment in the network.

7

8 Regarding claim 3, Safadi, Bloebaum and Vögel disclosed that the mobile phone
9 recipient sends a device certificate having a public key to the wireless sender (See Safadi
10 Paragraphs 0036 and 0041).

11 Regarding claims 4, 11, 17, and 34, Safadi, Bloebaum and Vögel disclosed that that the
12 mobile phone sender personalizes the protected content or content encryption key for the mobile
13 phone recipient (See Safadi Paragraphs 0036-0037 and 0044).

14 Regarding claims 6, 13, and 20, Safadi, Bloebaum and Vögel disclosed that the mobile
15 phone recipient verifies forwarded protected content received from the mobile phone sender by:
16 verifying the device certificate of the mobile phone sender (See Safadi Paragraph 0043); and
17 applying a private key of the mobile phone recipient in order for the recipient to consume the
18 protected content (See Safadi Paragraphs 0036-0037 and 0044).

19 Regarding claims 7, 14, and 21, Safadi, Bloebaum and Vögel disclosed that the protected
20 content is digital rights management protected content (See Safadi Paragraph 0034).

21 Regarding claims 10, and 19, Safadi, Bloebaum and Vögel disclosed that the peer-to-peer
22 forwarding/reception of DRM protected content module of the mobile phone recipient sends a

Art Unit: 2131

1 device certificate having a public key to the mobile phone sender (See Safadi Paragraphs 0036-
2 0037 and 0042).

3 Regarding claim 27, Safadi, Bloebaum and Vögel disclosed that the initial message
4 includes a device certificate to the mobile phone recipient (See Safadi Paragraph 0042).

5

6 Claims 5, 12, 18, 22, 26, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
7 unpatentable over Safadi, Bloebaum and Vögel as applied to claims 4, 8, and 17 respectively
8 above, and further in view of Mott et al. (US Patent Number 6,170,060) hereinafter referred to as
9 Mott.

10 Regarding claims 5, 12, and 18, Safadi, Bloebaum and Vögel disclosed that the steps for
11 personalizing include: encrypting the content or content encryption key using a public key of the
12 mobile phone recipient (See Safadi Paragraphs 0036-0037); and sending the protected content or
13 content encryption key and a device certificate of the mobile phone sender to the wireless
14 recipient (See Safadi Paragraphs 0042 and 0044), but failed to disclose signing encrypted content
15 or content encryption key using a private key of the mobile phone sender, or sending the
16 protected content with a device certificate of the sender.

17 Mott teaches that a digital signature should be appended to downloaded content in order
18 to be able to verify the data (See Mott Col. 11 Paragraph 2).

19 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
20 invention to employ the teachings of Mott in the content distribution system of Safadi, Bloebaum
21 and Vögel by including a signature of the content with the content. This would have been
22 obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to provide a

1 means for the recipient to verify the integrity of the data. Further, it was well known in the art at
2 the time of invention that the certificate of a digital signor could be included with the signed
3 object for transmission and therefore it would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in
4 the art at the time of invention to have done so.

5 Regarding claim 22, the combination of Safadi, Bloebaum, Vögel and Mott disclosed a
6 method comprising: forwarding a protected content or content encryption key from a first mobile
7 phone to a second mobile phone (Safadi Fig. 1 Element 20 and paragraph [0032] and Bloebaum
8 Col. 4 Lines 59-61) in a cellular network having a network infrastructure (Safadi Fig. 1 Element
9 20 and paragraph [0032]); sending a digital rights management device certificate containing a
10 public digital rights management key from the second mobile phone to the first mobile phone
11 (See Safadi Paragraph 0041); verifying the public digital rights management key by the first
12 mobile phone (See Safadi Paragraph 0041); personalizing digital rights management content or
13 content encryption key by encryption using a public key of the second mobile phone (See Safadi
14 Paragraphs 0036-0037 and 0044); signing encrypted digital rights management content or
15 content encryption key using a private digital rights management key of the first mobile phone
16 (See the rejection of claim 5 above and Mott Col. 11 Paragraph 2); sending encrypted and signed
17 digital rights management content or content encryption key together with a digital rights
18 management device certificate of the first mobile phone from the first mobile phone to the
19 second mobile phone (See the rejection of claim 5 above and Mott Col. 11 Paragraph 2);
20 verifying the digital rights management device certificate of the first mobile phone by the second
21 mobile phone (See Safadi Paragraph 0043); and applying a private digital rights management
22 key of the second mobile phone, if the private digital rights management key of the first mobile

1 phone is verified, in order for the second mobile to consume the protected content without
2 content personalization assistance from the network infrastructure of the cellular network(See
3 Safadi Paragraph 0044).

4 Regarding claim 26, see Safadi Paragraph 0042.

5 Regarding claim 33, see the rejection of claims 29-32 above.

6 Claims 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the
7 combination of Safadi, Bloebaum, Vögel and Mott as applied to claim 22 above, and further in
8 view of Gustafsson (US Patent Number 6,424,841).

9 Safadi, Bloebaum, Vögel and Mott disclosed sending encrypted and signed digital rights
10 management content to the first terminal and verifying the same in the first terminal (See the
11 rejection of claim 22 above), but failed to disclose sending confirmation or error messages.
12 However, Safadi, Bloebaum, Vögel and Mott did disclose that the communications were
13 between cell phones in a cellular network (Bloebaum Fig. 1 and Col. 4 Lines 59-61).

14 Gustafsson teaches that in a mobile phone system, acknowledgment messages should be
15 provided to the sender of a message by the recipient (See Gustafsson Col. 2 Paragraphs 3-4).

16 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
17 invention to employ the teachings of Gustafsson in the content distribution system of Safadi and
18 Mott by having the receiver either acknowledge proper receipt of the content or send an error
19 message to the sender. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the
20 art would have been motivated to ensure proper receipt of the content.

21 ***Conclusion***

22 Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, 17-22, 24-28, and 33-34 have been rejected.

Art Unit: 2131

1 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
2 examiner should be directed to MATTHEW T. HENNING whose telephone number is
3 (571)272-3790. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.

4 If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
5 supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the
6 organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

7 Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent
8 Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications
9 may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished
10 applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR
11 system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR
12 system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would
13 like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated
14 information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

15
16 /Matthew T Henning/

17 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2131